ESSAYS

ON SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM

I

QUESTIONS OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

BORIS DATSYUK

Prof. BORIS DATSYUK

ESSAYS ON SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM

QUESTIONS OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

Part I

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1976

Professor Boris Datsyuk, author of numerous works dealing with problems of building a socialist society in the Soviet Union, in this part traces the origins of the revolutionary theory of the proletariat and discusses Lenin's theory of socialist revolution.

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1976

Editing completed on December 16, 1975

CONTENTS

Foreword 5

Marxism-Leninism as an International Theory and a Weapon of Revolutionary Change in the World . . 7

The Origin of Human Society and Its Development 14

Social Classes and Class Struggle. The Role of Marxist-Leninist Parties in the Struggle to Safeguard the Interests of the Working People 23

The Functions, Types and Forms of the State . . . 30

Lenin's Theory of Socialist Revolution 40

Socialism and Communism—Two Phases of Communist Society 49

Foreword

This day and age occupies a special place in the history of mankind. The world is going through a crucial phase in its history–that of the transition from capitalism to socialism, and we are witnesses to this process and participants in it. The road to socialism as a better future for mankind was mapped by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and millions of people throughout the world want to learn about their theory.

This booklet deals with some aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory that are the most relevant to the present time. It discusses the origins of Marxism-Leninism and its international character, and shows why it is an instrument of revolutionary change in the world. It presents the Marxist-Leninist view on the origin of human society and the laws governing its development. It explains the meaning of social classes and class struggle. It shows the role of Marxist-Leninist Parties in the struggle to safeguard the interests of the working people. It gives the Marxist-Leninist view of the state, its functions, types and forms. And it discusses the meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the essence of Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, and shows why socialism and communism represent two phases of a single communist society.

In the second part of this work it is shown how the Marxist-Leninist theory is put into practice in the Soviet Union in conditions of an advanced socialist society.

It is not the purpose of this booklet to give a comprehensive account of all the theoretical and practical aspects of scientific communism. The aim of the author is to introduce the reader to the rudiments of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Marxism-Leninism as an International Theory and a Weapon of Revolutionary Change in the World

> "The philosophers have only **interpreted** the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to **change** it." [1]

These words were put down in his notebook by the 27-year-old Doctor of Philosophy Karl Marx in the spring of 1845 and remained his motto throughout his later life. They were also the motto of his friend and associate Friedrich Engels. The theory evolved by these two men, the subject of our essays, was later further developed by Vladimir Lenin, the founder of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet state. For more than a century working people have used this revolutionary theory as an effective instrument for changing the world.

When Marxism first emerged, Communists, the most dedicated fighters for the interests of the working class and of all working people, counted only a few hundred. Now the world communist movement numbers over 50 million people. Over the past three decades the membership of

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels. *Sel. Works* (in three volumes), Vol. 1, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969, p. 15.

Communist Parties in capitalist countries of Europe has grown 5-fold, and in the countries of Africa nearly 12-fold; on the American continent it has almost doubled, and in the non-socialist countries of Asia the increase is 190-fold.

To date about one-third of the world's population have freed themselves from exploitation. The world socialist system has made significant progress since it emerged after the Second World War. The countries constituting the system account for about 26 per cent of the world's territory, with their share in world industrial production amounting to nearly 39 per cent.

Most of the reactionary regimes that dominated Europe during the lifetime of Marx and Engels no longer exist. Colonial rule has collapsed in Africa and Asia, and the young independent states on these continents are gaining in strength. The independent countries of Africa, for example, which account for 90 per cent of that continent's population, extend to over 80 per cent of its territory. A number of them have adopted a socialist orientation in accordance with the wishes of the people.

What accounts for the overwhelming impact exerted by Marxist thought? The best answer to this question was given by Lenin who said that "the Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true." [1] Marxist-Leninist theory is based on a scientific analysis of reality, and provides answers to the most urgent questions of social development, science, culture and ideology. This theory shows the historical necessity of putting an end

---

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Worsk*, Vol. 19, p. 23.

to the system of exploitation and of building a society in which there are no rich or poor people, a society in which the means of production belong to the working people. The authors of the theory—Marx, Engels and Lenin—are among the greatest thinkers of all time.

The rise of Marxism was not something accidental; it was a logical outcome of historical progress. A revolutionary theory was urgently needed that would explain the meaning of the social processes taking place in the world and show how they could be changed. Above all, there was a need to define the place of capitalism in history and the role of the proletariat which first emerged on the political scene in the middle of the 19th century. Marx and Engels showed the historic mission of the proletariat as the grave-digger of the system of exploitation and builder of communist society, the most just society in the world.

There were attempts to develop a correct political, social and economic theory even before Marx and Engels, and the two men had great respect for such thinkers as Hegel and Feuerbach who represented German classical philosophy, Adam Smith, the father of English political economy, and Utopian Socialists Charles Fourier and Robert Owen. They regarded these thinkers as their immediate predecessors. In fact, Marxism was a logical successor to all that was progressive and valuable in philosophy up to that time.

It does not follow, however, that Marx's theory and the ideas of his predecessors are identical. Marxism is a distinctly new phase in philo-

sophical thought. It represents a revolution in philosophy. [1]

Marxism comprises three component parts: materialistic philosophy, economic theory and a theory of scientific communism. The question is: would it be correct to regard it as a single theory?

All three component parts are closely interrelated in that they serve a common purpose: each in its own way, whether philosophical, economic or political, provides a scientific analysis of the ways and means of putting an end to exploitation of man by man and of establishing socialism and communism throughout the world.

Marxism-Leninism is a science concerned with the laws governing the development of nature and society, with the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the achieving of the victory of socialism in all countries, and the building of a communist society.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that

---

[1] The main philosophical question since the birth of philosophy in ancient times has been the relationship between mind and matter. Those who believe that the mind takes precedence over matter, i. e., that ideas rather than material factors are the motive force of society, are called idealists. Materialists, on the other hand, hold that it is the social existence of people, notably the way in which they produce material wealth, that determines their world outlook, not ideas. Even the most outstanding materialist philosophers before Marx, such as Ludwig Feuerbach, were materialists only to the extent that they took a materialistic view of natural phenomena, but their concept of social development was idealistic. Marx and Engels extended materialism to the history of human society thus evolving historical materialism as a science of social development. Therein lies their outstanding achievement.

Marxism-Leninism is a cohesive theory, and one that has profound international significance. It applies to all countries, not just any one country, and the truth of this has been proved by the progress of peoples towards socialism and communism.

Today an intense ideological struggle has developed around the question of the international significance of Marxism-Leninism, with opportunists and revisionists of every description attacking the theory both from the right and the left. Confirmed dogmatists maintain that in applying Marxism-Leninism to revolutionary struggle Communists should ignore the distinctive historical, social and cultural features of their countries, that they should ignore the experience of revolutionary struggle gained by the people of individual countries, their progressive traditions, etc. Then there are those who preach so-called pluralism. They refuse to accept the universal significance of the laws discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin and do not recognize the joint contribution of all Communist Parties to Marxist theory. According to them, each country must have its "own", "national" Marxism and its "own", "national" socialism. In practice these two opposing views are nothing more than two sides of one coin; revisionism, whether it comes from the Right or from the Left, is a basis for political adventurism, reactionary nationalism and often outright anti-Sovietism.

Marxism-Leninism insists that Communists take into account the distinctive features of the revolutionary movement of each country and its experience in building a socialist society. The Soviet Union, which now has an advanced socialist

society, and the other socialist countries have followed a common basic pattern in building socialism. But at the same time there are also many distinctions, and to ignore them is to grope in the dark, to make mistakes in the process and do irreparable damage to a most noble cause–building of a new society.

Marxism does not recognize set rules and formulas which would be applicable to all times and stages of history. Marx and Engels insisted that their theory is not a dogma but a guide to action. For almost half a century they developed their theory introducing new ideas into it.

Imperialism as a new historical epoch emerged when Marx and Engels were no longer alive. The working class was confronted with new complex questions and tasks, and there was a need for clear and comprehensive answers. Now was the time for further developing Marxism in keeping with the changing world and the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat. This task was fulfilled by Vladimir Lenin.

Lenin's lifework was associated with a whole historical period of revolutionary change. He gave answers to the most burning questions posed by history, comprehensively developed the theory of socialist revolution and the building of communist society, provided the Russian and the international revolutionary movement with a strategy and tactics that were scientifically grounded, and led the working-class struggle to translate the ideals of socialism into life.

Lenin evolved a complete theory of the party as an organization that guides the working class, an organization that is absolutely essential to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat and to

build socialism and communism. He formulated the ideological, organizational, tactical and theoretical principles of the revolutionary party of the proletariat as a new type of party.

Marxism-Leninism is a living revolutionary doctrine. It constantly draws on the revolutionary practice of the world communist and working-class movement, and all Marxist-Leninist Parties contribute to the development of the theory of revolution. The theoretical contribution of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) has won general recognition. It is this creative development of Marxism-Leninism that makes it invincible.

The Origin of Human Society and Its Development

Nearly forty years ago a book by a group of Western sociologists was published which treats history as "rationalized irrationality". The book made quite a stir when it first appeared. Since then many changes have taken place in the world; the life of millions of people has radically changed both in the political and economic sense. And yet the thesis of that book, according to which there do not exist any laws governing social development, still has supporters in the West today.

The history of mankind is sometimes pictured by non-Marxist scholars as a conglomeration of unrelated facts and events, as consisting of the biographies of a relatively small number of individuals and "heroes"–kings, tsars and military leaders. Accordingly human history is like a desert of myriads of sand grains.

The subject of this chapter, therefore, is not an academic one far removed from present-day realities, but constitutes an area of intense struggle between Marxism-Leninism and sociological concepts opposed to it.

The denial of the existence of laws pertaining to the emergence and development of human society is designed to disarm the working people ideologically in their struggle against the exploiters. Capitalist ideologists attempt to refute the Marxist view of the development of

human society as a process governed by objective laws, and thus to deny the fact that the collapse of capitalism and the victory of socialism throughout the world are unavoidable owing to the laws of social development.

People have always lived and worked together.

Even Robinson Crusoe, when he found himself on a desert island, kept his ties with society, as it were, through utensils, clothing, arms, as well as skills, which he had acquired while living among people.

Human society emerged nearly a million years ago when our early ancestors turned from biological to social existence. At that time people did not breed cattle, or tilled land or engaged in handicrafts. They provided for themselves by gathering edible fruit which they found in the wild and by fishing and hunting. They were often victims of a hostile environment. They suffered from volcano eruptions, earthquakes and floods. They died of hunger and were killed by wild animals.

What is it that has made it possible for them to survive, organize social production and then reach the level of modern social and technological progress?

Can this really have been some senseless accident or the will of Providence? Marxism-Leninism does not accept such views. Human society originated and developed under the impact of objective laws, which were discovered by Marx and Engels, and the most important of them says that material production has been the basis of the existence and development of society throughout its history.

Indeed, the primary condition of the very existence of people is *the production of material wealth,* and they get together in a common effort to achieve this purpose. Marxism-Leninism, therefore, regards society as a historical community of people united in *the production of material wealth.*

It is, of course, man alone who builds machines and mechanisms and sets them in motion. Man accumulates knowledge, expertise and skills. Therefore the people who are engaged in production and the means which they employ together form the crucial element of any production–*the productive forces of society.* The working people are the producers of all material wealth on earth, and therefore they are the real makers of history.

Another element that is absolutely essential to any mode of production is the economic relationships between people, formed in the process of production and distribution of material wealth. These relationships are described by Marxism-Leninism as *relations of production.* They indicate the *predominant form of ownership of the means of production* in any given society. Under capitalism, for example, the basic means of production are privately owned. Exploitation of man by man is the dominant feature of capitalist society. The capitalists are the dominant class, and the proletariat is the oppressed class. The form of ownership also determines the manner in which material wealth is distributed. The capitalist does not produce any material wealth, but he draws fabulous profit because he owns property, while the working people who are the real producers of material

wealth have to be content with niggardly earnings which are sometimes hardly sufficient to satisfy their basic needs.

Relations of production are entirely different under socialism where public ownership of the means of production rules out the existence of a capitalist class and exploitation of man by man. Socialist society consists of two congenial classes of working people–industrial workers and farmers–and professional people–the socialist intelligentsia. Relations between them are those of close co-operation and mutual assistance.

Thus for each society there is a corresponding system of productive forces and relations of production, or *mode of production.*

In a malicious attempt to distort Marxism-Leninism opponents of communism maintain that the theory ignores the sphere of intellectual life, politics and ideology and reduces the progress of society to the need of satisfying the material requirements of people. This is an obvious fabrication. What Marxism does is to single out one among many factors *as the most important,* while its opponents assert that it does so ignoring *all the others.*

The most important factor is the dominant system of socio-economic relations in a society or its *basis.* To this basis there is always a corresponding superstructure. This includes the legal, political and ideological relations existing in the given society.

If the development of society obeys objective laws, laws that cannot be changed at will, does this mean that the making of history is an automatic process in which man is nothing more

than a blind instrument of these laws? The answer is no. Although Marxism-Leninism says that objective factors play a decisive part in the historical process, it also attaches much importance to *subjective factors* such as the activity of the classes and their parties and leaders, the political awareness of the people and the level of their organization and the role of the state. Society's development is in a significant measure influenced by the policies of the state and political parties and by prominent statesmen, public leaders and scientists and scholars.

The distinction drawn between the basis and the superstructure reflects the fact that people's behaviour is conditional on the particular circumstances of the period in history in which they live, and it at the same time provides a key to an understanding and appraisal of their behaviour. When their ideals reflect progressive social tendencies, ones that accord with the interests of the working people, they exert an immense impact on society. This has been amply demonstrated by Marxism-Leninism whose revolutionary ideals have become a prime motive force of social progress.

Conversely, outdated and reactionary ideas hamper the search of the working people for ways of safeguarding their interests. They prevent the working people from gaining an insight into the real trends of contemporary or future social development. A case in point is the theories of modern opponents of communism and Right-wing and Left-wing revisionists, theories that run counter to the interests of working people either directly or indirectly.

Although the superstructure exercises an in-

fluence on all spheres of public life in a given society, the productive forces always remain the most active and revolutionary element of the mode of production. Thus the most important law governing social progress discovered by Marx is the *law of correspondence between productive forces and relations of production.*

As long as the correspondence is maintained, the development of the society shows an upward trend. Here is an example. When primitive man used primitive tools made of stone, there was a correspondence between the relations of production and the level of productive forces. But when people acquired the more efficient metal tools and there was no longer a need for collective economic activity, there appeared inequality in respect to property and social status, and this gave rise to exploitation of man by man. The relations of production in the primitive society–joint ownership of the means of production and primitive equality–collapsed. The primitive society gave way to slave ownership, which marked the advent of an exploitative society.

The conflict between productive forces and relations of production is expressed in its most acute form in contemporary capitalist society. In the epoch of imperialism the productive forces of capitalist society are fettered by relations of production. In an attempt to disprove this, opponents of Marxism usually point to the fact that some of the major scientific and technological breakthroughs have been made in capitalist countries.

Indeed, individual capitalist economies have shown high rates of development at one time or

another. Italy and Japan are two cases in point. And Marxism-Leninism has never accepted the so-called theory of stagnation. Under imperialism capitalists do make use of scientific and technological advance in one way or another. Yet on the whole imperialist monopolies can no longer cope with the enormous potential of productive forces that have been created by capitalism. As a system imperialism cannot do away with widespread economic and monetary crises, or solve the problem of growing unemployment, declining salaries and wages, and the like.

The productive forces of imperialism as a world system have reached a level which makes it necessary that they should be publicly owned.

The logical outcome of the growing conflict between productive forces and relations of production is social revolution and collapse of the system of exploitation. Slave ownership, for instance, gave way to feudalism which was then ousted by capitalism. Capitalist relations were replaced by socialist relations, first in the Soviet Union and then in several other countries.

Some Western philosophers and economists contend that the Marxist-Leninist theory of society is outdated because it was evolved before the current scientific and technological revolution. American economists John Galbraith and Walt Rostow and French philosopher Raymond Aron maintain that the two opposing systems—capitalist and socialist—are bound to converge economically and ideologically. They say that a "post-industrial" (or a "single industrial") society is growing out of this process, a society which is neither capitalist nor socialist.

In inventing the myth of a post-industrial society in which the means of production remain in the hands of capitalist monopolies, capitalist ideologists are making yet another attempt to whitewash the long discredited capitalist system.

A socialist society is a basically new type of society. In contrast to a capitalist society the means of production under socialism belong to the working people who are the producers of material wealth. This alone makes any convergence of capitalism and socialism impossible.

Does it follow, then, that under socialism productive forces have lost their active role and that the socialist society moves forward without any contradictions since there are no economic crises, unemployment and other negative aspects of capitalist society? The answer is no. Under socialism productive forces stay the most active element of production, and again they eventually come into contradictions to relations of production. A society progresses through overcoming contradictions. However, there is a difference between contradictions and antagonisms, and Lenin emphasized the need to distinguish between the two. Antagonisms disappear under socialism, while contradictions remain. An instance of contradictions in a socialist society is the gap between the constantly growing needs of its members and the level of production. The Communist Party and the socialist state, which express the interests of the people and proceed from the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, take steps to overcome contradictions arising in society. The decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress are an outstanding

example of such efforts. The Congress called for a significant improvement in the material and cultural standards of the people as the primary objective of the current five-year economic plan. It outlined this objective on the basis of a scientific analysis of the country's economic development and its economic growth prospects.

Social Classes and Class Struggle. The Role of Marxist-Leninist Parties in the Struggle to Safeguard the Interests of the Working People

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." [1] "Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class." [2]

These words are to be found in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, the first programme of scientific communism. Written in 1848, it is one of the most outstanding works by Marx and Engels. Lenin noted that the *Manifesto* contained a brilliant and clear-cut exposition of a new world outlook, a scientifically founded theory of class struggle.

The origin of social classes and their role in history is a subject of a long-standing and bitter ideological struggle. This struggle has become especially intense today as a result of mankind's transition from a system of exploitation to a society which rules out private ownership of the means of production, a society in which there is neither exploitation nor antagonism between the classes. This transition is the most important development of our time.

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op. cit.*, p. 108.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

Many Western sociologists assert that classes have existed since the beginning of the history of mankind and will continue to exist as long as there are people on earth. These "theorists" maintain that class antagonism results from the supremacy of biologically-strong individuals over weaker, inferior ones. Like capitalist ideology as a whole, this false theory, which is closely related to the ideology of racism and more recently to neo-colonialism, is designed to disarm the working people in their struggle against the exploiters. If one were to accept this theory one would have to conclude that the oppressed classes themselves are responsible for their poverty and misery, and not the economic system under which they live. The apologists for imperialism are in fact saying to the working people: why fight against exploitation, why waste efforts and even lives when Nature herself has preordained that you shall always be oppressed?

Classes emerged at a certain point in history, and the time will come when they will disappear. There was a time when there were no oppressors or oppressed. That was the time of primitive society which, incidentally, lasted hundreds of thousands times longer than societies in which class antagonism existed. In the division of society into antagonistic classes private ownership of the means of production is the determining factor. Lenin gave a definition of classes in his work *A Great Beginning.*

"Classes," wrote Lenin, "are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most

cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it." [1]

Among the factors that determine the class to which people belong, *their relation to the means of production* is the most important. This relation also determines the part that a given class plays in a system of social production. The class that owns the means of production in a society of class antagonisms occupies the dominant position in the field of economy, politics and ideology. This class exploits those who are deprived of the means of production and appropriates the fruits of their labour.

This means that biological factors do not come into play here, and what is needed to end exploitaiton is to change the economic relationship between people, not their biological make-up. And the way to achieve this is to replace private ownership of the means of production by public ownership. That this is so is abundantly clear from the experience of the Soviet Union in the last fifty years and more and from that of the world socialist system which emerged more than two decades ago.

After the Russian October Socialist Revolution of 1917 all means of production both in town and countryside–factories, mines and the land–became public property. Antagonistic classes and all causes of exploitation have been eliminated in the Soviet Union in the process

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421.

of building a socialist society. A cohesive society has emerged, a society consisting of two congenial classes–workers and farmers. The years have also seen the rise of a new type of intelligentsia, one that has strong ties with the people.

The working class has undergone qualitative and quantitative changes over the years of Soviet government. It now possesses, together with the rest of the people, the vast resources of the socialist society, in sharp contrast to its position under capitalism as a class deprived of all means of production. The way of life and social status of the farmers have also undergone radical changes. The economic inefficiency of small-scale production has given way to large-scale co-operative production involving the extensive use of farm machinery. The farmers have become a distinctly new class, a socialist class.

But a socialist society is not yet a classless society although there is no exploitation or class antagonisms under socialism. There are two types of ownership under socialism: the factories, mines, railways, etc. belong to the entire nation; on the other hand, co-operative farms and other co-operative organizations own property that belongs to them. Both types of ownership are socialist in character (since no private ownership of the means of production is involved), but as long as they exist there will be certain differences in the people's relation to the means of production. Therefore classes will only disappear under communism. The way this will come about will be discussed in a later chapter.

The experience of the Soviet people, who were the first to free themselves from exploiters,

indicates that oppressed peoples have only one way to freedom and a better life and that is the way of class struggle leading to the elimination of the exploiting classes.

There are three forms of struggle of the proletariat–economic, political and ideological–to achieve its goal. Political struggle is the most important form of class struggle. Its goal is the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The struggle of classes is led by political parties. Normally all classes form their own parties. But as history shows, the proletariat can destroy the power of the exploiters and build a socialist society only if it has its own Marxist-Leninist Party. Of course, working people also have other organizations; trade unions are one example. However, it is a party which has Marxism-Leninism as its guide that is the highest form of organization of the proletariat as a class. The party is the vanguard of the proletariat and the most organized part of it. It most consistently expresses the interests of the working people in their struggle against imperialism, and in their fight for socialism, democracy, national liberation and peace among nations. Lenin described the Party of Soviet Communists as the intelligence, honour and conscience of our times.

There is a total of 88 Communist and Workers' Parties in the world today. In the socialist countries Communist and Workers' Parties are the governing parties. In many capitalist countries Communists provide leadership for broad sections of the people. Communist Parties ex-

cercise a growing influence in countries with widespread movements for national liberation.

The world communist and working-class movement is exerting an increasing impact on mankind's movement toward progress. Reality itself completely refutes the inventions by capitalist ideologists and by renegades such as Ernst Fischer and Roger Garaudy who have been expelled from the Austrian and the French Communist Party respectively. It also disproves the views of the petty-bourgeois ideologist Herbert Marcuse about the "erosion" of the working class and its revolutionary role.

Similar views are held by Pitirim Sorokin, Reinard Bendix, Seymour Martin Lipset and other authors of the theory of "social stratification" and "social mobility". According to this theory, capitalist society is not a society of antagonistic classes–workers and capitalists–but a conglomeration of big and small "strata" where people form groups on the basis of their age, education, income, interests in sport and the like. The architects of this false theory would like the working people to believe that a capitalist and a worker of the same age fall in one and the same category. They ignore the fact that the capitalist and the worker belong to opposing classes. They refuse to acknowledge that the class struggle is a struggle between irreconcilable antagonisms. All these false theories are intended to disarm the working class ideologically and undermine its revolutionary unity.

But the world undergoes revolutionary changes despite the wishes of imperialist ideologists. A graphic illustration of the revolutionary role of the working class is the unprecedented

growth of strike action throughout the capitalist world. The total number of people involved in the strike movement each year in the last several years stands at 60-70 million.

The proletariat of the countries that have freed themselves from colonial rule is becoming an increasingly active historical force and now forms a sizable part of the world working class.

The working class of the socialist countries is exercising an important influence on the course of world development. It is the main force behind the success of the world socialist system in its economic competition with capitalism and is the decisive force in the current struggle of the working people against the aggressive policies of imperialism. As a class that has strong internationalist commitments, the working class of the socialist countries safeguards the cause of peace and gives all necessary assistance to the international working class and the national-liberation movement.

Lenin's idea about the leading role of the working class in the building of a socialist and communist society has been developed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. "The working class," Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said, "has been and remains the main productive force of society. Its revolutionary spirit, discipline, organization and collectivism determine its leading position in the system of socialist social relations."

The Functions, Types and Forms of the State

We all remember from our school days the stories of successive ancient empires of the Orient and Europe, of Asia and the Americas. How did these states come about? What role did they play in history? Why had they disappeared from the world? Since the state is one of the most complicated social phenomena, these and other questions concerning its origin, nature and significance pose a most complex theoretical problem.

The Marxist theory of classes and the class struggle provides the key to an understanding of the nature of the state as a historical phenomenon. The state emerged when society became divided into antagonistic classes. Lenin pointed out in one of his works: "There was a time when there was no state, when general ties, the community itself, discipline and the ordering of work were maintained by force of custom and tradition, by the authority or the respect enjoyed by the elders of the clan or by women." [1]

It would be wrong, however, to picture the tribal system as a reign of anarchy, as ideologists of declassed groups and the American hippie type try to do, calling mankind to return to the "unrestricted freedom" of primitive

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 475.

society. In fact, people have always defended their established order.

On the other hand, those theoreticians who describe the state as an instrument serving the interests of all classes also distort reality. For "the state," says Lenin, "is a product and a manifestation of the *irreconcilability* of class antagonisms." [1] The state emerged as an instrument of domination by the exploiters.

The ruling classes exercise their political power through a machinery of coercion–the army, police and the judicial system.

Not all states are of the same type. There have been three types of state based on exploitation–the state based on slave ownership, the feudal state and the capitalist state. All three have this in common: a minority of exploiters dominates the working people.

The socialist state is an entirely different type of state. It is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat which first emerged after the 1917 October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Now it exists in a number of other socialist countries. Power in all these countries is held by the working people led by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Parties. No exploiters hold governmental positions there though they did exist for a time during the transition period from capitalism to socialism.

When a socialist society is built, the dictatorship of the proletariat turns into the socialist state of the entire people.

As can be seen, the type of state depends on the particular class that holds dominant econo-

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 387.

mic positions, i.e. the class that owns the means of production. Thus there are slave-owning, feudal, capitalist and socialist states depending on their class basis.

The state has a variety of forms, and there are any number of examples from history of one type of state functioning in different forms. Slave-owners in earlier times excercised their dictatorship through different forms–the monarchy, rule of aristocracy or republic. Modern capitalist states exist in the form of constitutional monarchy, as in the case of Britain; others are republics, for example, France and Italy, and still others are dictatorships as in the case of Chile. There are also racist regimes like those in Rhodesia and South Africa.

"Bourgeois states are most varied in form," Lenin wrote, "but their essence is the same: all these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.*" [1]

The dictatorship of the proletariat also exists in different forms. Its prototype, the Paris Commune, was set up in 1871 following an uprising of proletarians in the French capital. The first form of a victorious dictatorship of the proletariat–the Soviets–emerged in Russia in the wake of a proletarian revolution. Another form of the dictatorship of the proletariat–People's Democracy–appeared after the Second World War in a number of countries in Central and South-Eastern Europe and in Asia.

People's Democracy has a number of distinctive features as well as features that are com-

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 413.

mon to the dictatorship of the proletariat in all socialist countries. The emergence of People's Democracy was dictated by several objective factors characterizing the contemporary world revolutionary process. This form of the dictatorship of the proletariat reflected the peculiarity of the development of socialist revolution at a time when imperialism had become weaker and the balance of forces in the world had changed in favour of socialism. One distinctive feature of this form of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the existence of several political parties. A number of People's Democracies have mass political organizations uniting non-proletarian democratic parties, such as the Fatherland Front in Bulgaria and the National Front in the German Democratic Republic. In some People's Democracies, such as Hungary and Romania, a multi-party system has given way to a one-party system.

What accounts for this diversity of form within one type of state? First of all, it is a result of differences in economic development in different countries, the balance of class forces in these countries and the nature of class antagonisms. The form of state also depends on such factors as the historical context in which the people of a given country develop, their national traditions and the like.

All states perform certain domestic and foreign policy functions. In a society of social antagonisms the purpose of the state is mainly to protect the interests of the dominant class and suppress the resistance of the mass of exploited people. The second function, which is closely linked with the first, is to conquer foreign

lands, enslave neighbouring nations and defend its own territory against military encroachment by other countries.

The functions of the socialist state totally differ from those of the capitalist state, the socialist state being based on the dictatorship of the proletariat. What, exactly, is the dictatorship of the proletariat?

Lenin gave this definition: "If we translate the Latin, scientific, historico-philosophical term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' into simpler language, it means just the following:

"Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people in the struggle to throw off the yoke of capital, in actually carrying it out, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system and in the entire struggle for the complete abolition of classes." [1]

The need for this type of state during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism stems from the nature of this period, and this will be the subject of discussion of a later chapter. All pre-socialist societies emerged from societies that immediately preceded them. Socialism, on the other hand, does not spring from capitalism. There is a period of revolutionary change between the two, and Marx was the first to point this out. The crucial question during this period is which will be the winner—will the growing socialist society win over capi-

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 420.

talism or will capitalism strangle it? Without the dictatorship of the proletariat socialism cannot be expected to win.

Historical experience indicates that when the working class assumes power and starts building a socialist society, the deposed exploiting classes usually offer frenzied resistance. The period of transition from capitalism to socialism is accompanied by various forms of class struggle. Lenin noted the following forms on the basis of the record of the first years of Soviet government–suppression of the overthrown class of exploiters, civil war, neutralization of the petty bourgeoisie, employment of professional people who had served the former regime for the benefit of socialism and the fostering of a new attitude to work.

Reactionary classes in all socialist countries have in one way or another resisted the revolutionary changes carried out by the working class led by Marxist-Leninist Parties. In this connection the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a state of a new type are a matter of great importance.

Lenin wrote: "The dictatorship of the proletariat means a persistent struggle–bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative–against the forces and traditions of the old society." [1]

Like other types of state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat performs certain domestic and external functions, but they are radically different from those carried out by

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 44.

states based on exploitation. One domestic function of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to suppress the resistance of the deposed classes. But the dictatorship of the proletariat does more than perform the function of suppression. It is the main instrument of building a socialist society and as such it provides leadership in the work of developing the national economy. It creates the necessary conditions for the development of productive forces in industry and agriculture, promotes the formation of new relations of production, exercises control over production and consumption, protects public property, ensures rising living standards, etc.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the first type of state ever to perform cultural and educational functions, carry out a revolution in the field of culture and ideology, organize public education and conduct intensive work to educate the people in the spirit of the new society.

The foreign-policy functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat also differ radically from those of the capitalist state. They consist in strengthening the country's defences, promoting peace and creating favourable external conditions for the building of a communist society, and safeguarding the socialist country against military attacks by imperialists. Another important foreign-policy function is related to the emergence of the world socialist system. And that lies in promoting fraternal co-operation among the socialist countries and strengthening their unity and security.

The basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat, its underlying principle, is the alliance of the

working class and farmers. Lenin said that "without such an alliance democracy is unstable and socialist transformation is impossible." [1]

Lenin had repeatedly pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a new type of democracy, that it is democracy for the vast majority of the population. For the first time in history it offers workers and farmers a real opportunity to take part in the administration of the state, to play an effective role in enacting legislations and in implementing them. In this way it radically differs from bourgeois democracy under which such opportunities largely remain on paper. The dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin said, was an authority springing directly from the masses "and was a direct and immediate instrument of the popular masses, of their will." [2]

The political basis, both in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat and in conditions of the state of the entire people, has been formed in the Soviet Union by the Soviets, i.e., political bodies composed of people's representatives who are elected by the people. These bodies wield power at all levels throughout the country. The people—the working class, farmers and professionals—send their best representatives to the Soviets. Moreover, millions of people are members of the various standing committees of the Soviets at grass-roots level.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a whole system of mass organizations. It includes trade

---

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 417.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 352.

unions, co-operatives, the Komsomol and other organizations which reflect the interests of the people generally.

The guiding force behind the dictatorship of the proletariat is Marxist-Leninist Communist and Workers' Parties. As parties of the governing class they lead the people along the road to great economic, political and social transformations.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the state of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. The class structure of society radically changes with the achievement of socialism. As said earlier, after the elimination of exploiting classes in the Soviet Union there remained two congenial classes, the working class and co-operative farmers, with the intelligentsia forming a social stratum.

When socialism has firmly established itself and work is under way to build a communist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat as a form of state which has fulfilled its historical mission turns into a *state of the entire people.* This type of state is not a new type of state, but a socialist state at a higher stage of its historical development. Its distinctive feature is the increasing role of the people in governing the country and in organizing and directing the national economy. The emphasis on organization and economic management is an important aspect of the extended internal and external functions of this socialist state. But it does not follow that the working class has lost its guiding role after the transition from the dictatorship of the proletariat to a state of the entire people. On the contrary, in the Soviet Union its role in all spheres of public life has been enhanced

as a result of the emergence of an advanced socialist society. The working class retains its guiding role in a state of the entire people during the period of transition from socialism to communism.

Lenin's Theory of Socialist Revolution

Marxists call social revolution the motive force of history. Any revolution, particularly a socialist one, stimulates social progress. After the victory of socialist revolution, the period of prehistory of mankind comes to an end and real history begins.

The history of the Soviet Union provides a good example of the dynamic nature of revolutionary change. Whereas capitalism took almost a century to establish itself as a social system, socialism in the Soviet Union took firm root only two decades after the overthrow of the landlords and capitalists. Socialism would have achieved even speedier and more significant progress had it not been necessary to rebuff military attacks by imperialists, fight internal counter-revolution and rebuild the war-ravaged economy.

The theory of socialist revolution was advanced by Lenin in a number of works, including *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* written at the time of the First World War (1914-18). This work is a major contribution to Marxist-Leninist thought. Lenin developed a theory of socialist revolution in the conditions of imperialism as a new epoch in history. Imperialism, Lenin showed, is the highest and last stage of capitalism, one where socialist revolution becomes inevitable owing to class contradictions reaching a breaking point, in particular, the contradiction

between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation of the results of workers' labour.

This process does not take place in all countries simultaneously. Until it grew into imperialism, i.e., until about the middle of the 19th century, capitalism showed even rates of development in nearly all countries of the world, thus creating conditions for the simultaneous victory of proletarian revolutions in all these countries, or at least in a majority of them. Marx and Engels, who lived before the advent of imperialism in fact believed that socialist revolution would occur more or less simultaneously in all the capitalist countries or in a majority of them.

Lenin made a detailed analysis of the world's economic and political development in the era of imperialism and formulated a law of capitalist development during this period. According to this law, different capitalist countries show an extremely uneven pattern of development, with some countries developing faster than the others thus providing built-in conditions for an early socialist revolution. "From this it follows irrefutably," said Lenin, "that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries." [1]

History has confirmed this thesis. Indeed, socialist revolution first achieved victory in one country–Russia. Having overthrown the power of capitalists and landlords, it gave a powerful stimulus to the revolutionary and national-liberation movement throughout the world.

Lenin regarded social revolution as a natural

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 79.

outcome of social development. A victorious revolution is not the result of chance occurrences or isolated political mistakes, as opponents of scientific communism would have us believe. Revolution takes place in a country as a result of its economic, political and social development. It cannot be exported; nor does it come about because some individuals or groups of individuals want it. "Of course, there are people who believe that revolution can break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement. These people are either mad or they are provocateurs," Lenin wrote. [1]

Marxist-Leninist Parties take a resolute stand against political adventurism and the conspiratorial tactics that accompany it. They oppose the actions of extremist groups isolated from revolutionary forces. Such tactics immeasurably harm the cause of revolution since there can be no revolution without a revolutionary situation or other objective and subjective factors that are necessary for a revolution to succeed. Lenin said that the basis of a revolutionary situation is a profound crisis affecting all spheres of public life and all classes. It is that moment when the great mass of oppressed people can no longer live in the old way and when the "upper classes" can no longer rule in the old way. The following inter-related factors are characteristic of a revolutionary situation: a crisis amid the "upper" classes, growing hardships of the oppressed classes and a significant increase in the revolutionary activity of the masses.

In his work *"Left-Wing" Communism, An In-*

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 480.

fantile Disorder (April-May 1920) Lenin formulated the principal law of revolution, namely, that a revolution is impossible without a nation-wide economic and political crisis.

The question of the proletariat's allies occupies an important place in Lenin's theory of socialist revolution. Lenin attacked the theory of so-called "pure" revolutions, revolutions in which the opposing classes confront each other in much the same way as did the knights in the Middle Ages. The world revolutionary movement has disproved this false theory. History shows that socialist revolutions have always been revolutions by the people. They are carried out by the people led by the working class and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist Party. "The proletarian revolution," Lenin said, "is impossible without the sympathy and support of the overwhelming majority of the working people." [1] Lenin regarded peasants as the main ally of the proletariat in a socialist revolution. Another ally is the urban democratic, non-proletarian population.

The 1917 October Socialist Revolution refuted the opportunist dogma according to which a victorious socialist revolution is possible only in a country where the proletariat forms the majority of the population. Today, too, revisionists contend that the revolution in Russia, where peasants formed the majority of the population, came about "by accident". This revolution, they maintain, is not socialist at all but an "overdue" bourgeois-democratic revolution or even a peasant revolution. To make such assertions is to shut one's eyes to the record of history, which

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 60.

shows that the proletariat is the leader of revolution, not on account of its numerical strength, but because it is the most politically aware and organized class. The working class is guided by a party equipped with a scientific theory–Marxism-Leninism. The strength of the working class lies in its ties with the broad masses. The working class rallies around itself all democratic elements of society.

As early as 1905, at the time of the first Russian revolution, Lenin pointed out that in the epoch of imperialism there existed an organic link between the struggle of the working people for democracy and the struggle of the proletariat for socialism. The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a bourgeois-democratic revolution. It did not have immediate socialist objectives. Its purpose was to overthrow the monarchy, replace it with a democratic republic, take the land from the landlords and give it to the peasants and introduce an eight-hour working day for the workers. It was the first popular revolution of the epoch of imperialism, and its characteristic feature was a new balance of class forces. The bourgeois revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries had been led by the bourgeoisie. History shows that in the epoch of imperialism a bourgeois-democratic revolution affects the *entire system of imperialist domination* and that it is anti-imperialist in character although it is spearheaded against feudalism or its remnants. None but the working class can be the leader of such a revolution. From this Lenin arrived at the important conclusion that there is a drawing closer together of the socialist and the democratic revolution in the epoch of imperialism. He showed that a bour-

geois-democratic revolution can grow into a socialist revolution.

The Soviet Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties have further developed Lenin's ideas about the correlation of the democratic and socialist movements and have applied them in their work.

The main document adopted by the conference of Communist and Workers' Parties that met in Moscow in 1969 makes these points: "In the course of anti-monopolist and anti-imperialist united action, favourable conditions are created for uniting all democratic trends into a political alliance capable of decisively limiting the role played by the monopolies... The main force in this democratic alliance is the working class." [1]

State monopoly capitalism is continuously and to an increasing degree aggravating the antagonism between the ruling upper classes and the working people both in town and in the countryside. In the late 60's this manifested itself in widespread actions by the working people against monopolies. A distinctive feature of such actions is that the working class is joined by farmers, intellectuals, office workers, students, small property owners and others.

Opponents of communism depict socialist revolution as a triumph of brute force and bloodshed. "Left" extremists, on the other hand, regard revolution as armed struggle and nothing more. Lenin pointed out that Communists reject violence as an ideal. "The working class," he

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969.* Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 27.

said, "would, of course, prefer to take power *peacefully.*" [1] The achievement of political power by the proletariat should not necessarily involve military action and armed struggle. In some countries, under certain conditions, the proletariat can assume power by peaceful means. In Russia, for example, the bourgeois-democratic revolution that took place in February of 1917 created the possibility for the proletariat to take power by peaceful means, and in fact the revolution was moving towards a socialist revolution when the capitalists checked this process thus wrecking the chance for a peaceful transfer of power. In early July, 1917, the capitalist government ordered the shooting of peaceful demonstrations of workers in Petrograd and a number of other cities. The capitalists, therefore, were the first to use armed force against the working people. They were the first to unleash an armed struggle, which led to their ultimate defeat, to the victory of the working class and the establishment of Soviet government.

Whether or not the transition to socialism is achieved by peaceful means depends on specific historical conditions. But even the peaceful road to socialism involves revolutionary change since it means the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and public ownership of the means of production.

Lenin did not regard these two methods of transition to socialism as polarized extremes. Armed struggle may become unavoidable if the exploiting classes resort to violence as was the case in Russia.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 276.

In September and October, 1917, when the Communists in Russia were preparing for armed struggle with the capitalists, Lenin wrote a number of articles on the subject of armed uprising, which he regarded as an art, as a special form of political struggle governed by its own laws. He warned against not taking uprising seriously and attached great significance to the choice of the right moment for an uprising. He said that an uprising can be launched only when the majority of the people support the revolutionary Party, when the revolutionary movement has spread throughout the country and the capitalist government has become politically bankrupt.

Lenin clearly distinguished between popular revolution on the one hand, and on the other, putsches, conspiracies and coups, which rabid reactionaries today depict as "revolutions" in an attempt to mislead the masses.

Lenin was looking far ahead when he said that the theory of socialist revolution would be advanced and enriched as it drew on new experience. This profound observation has been confirmed by the revolutions that have led to the emergence of People's Democracies in Europe, Asia and in Cuba, and by the national-liberation movement which has produced a new type of democratic revolution—a revolution of national liberation.

Lenin repeatedly noted that socialist revolution radically differs from all other types of social revolutions. All previous revolutions did nothing more than replace one form of exploitation by another. Socialist revolution is the only type of revolution that does away with exploitation for all time and frees the working people from

all forms of social oppression. It does not confine itself to the destruction of an outdated system, but leads to the establishment of an entirely new and better system of relations.

No other revolution in history has aimed at setting up a new system of economic and social relations. No other revolution has aimed at transforming culture and ideology in the interest of the broadest sections of the working people. Lenin's theory of socialist revolution contains a programme for the building of a socialist society, a programme which forms an inseparable part of this theory. The Soviet Union was the first country to implement the programme in full. It has now built an advanced socialist society, and the nation is engaged in an all-out effort to build a communist society.

Socialism and Communism—Two Phases of Communist Society

Only a comparatively short time ago socialism was a goal to strive for. Now it has become a reality and the way of life of nearly one-third of the world's population. That the world socialist system is the most influential political force of today is an undisputable fact.

Since the Soviet Union embarked on the untrodden path of socialism it has built an advanced socialist society which rests on a firm material and technological base and has a high level of productivity. Thus, for example, in 1972 the country's monthly industrial output exceeded the output of the entire year of 1940. And industrial output will show a still higher increase in the coming years. During the five-year plan period ending 1975 it is expected to grow by 42-44 per cent.

The advanced socialist society is based on highly developed relations of production and unbreakable friendship between the country's nationalities and ethnic groups who are fused into a new historical community–the Soviet people. The present level of socialism in the Soviet Union means comprehensive democracy and high cultural and material standards for the entire people. Here are a few figures. Since 1940 real incomes have grown more than 4-fold and the output of consumer goods has increased more than 7-fold. The number of graduates from col-

leges, universities and secondary schools has risen more than 6-fold.

Once an advanced socialist society has been established, it is then possible to launch large-scale work to build communism. Communism is the goal of the Soviet Communist Party, and this is set out in its Programme. "Communism," says the Programme, "is a highly organized society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognized by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people." [1]

This definition is in keeping with Lenin's treatment of socialism and communism as two phases of communist society. Lenin said that "what is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the 'first', or lower, phase of communist society." [2]

Thus, socialism and communism, the two phases of communist society, have much in common. The main common characteristic is their economic basis—public ownership of the means of production. They have a common pattern of relations of production. Their economic and social development is based on planning and administration of society by scientific methods.

There are a number of general laws governing the process of building a communist society under socialism. The working class not only is the leading force in society, but its role in all

---

[1] *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1961, p. 59.

[2] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 471.

spheres of public life is significantly enhanced. Marxist-Leninist Parties also come to play a more important guiding role. The alliance between the working class and the farmers becomes even closer; there is a rapid rise in productivity, etc.

The transition from socialism to communism does not require a social revolution since both rest on a common economic foundation. It takes place as the socialist society gains strength and moves forward. As Lenin pointed out, "communism... can only develop when socialism has become firmly established." [1]

The question may arise whether it is possible to bypass the first phase, i.e., socialism, and "leap" into communism. Lenin repeatedly warned against this kind of "Leftist" folly. All attempts to make such "leaps" have ended in total failure. A case in point is the "leap" organized by the Maoists. It is a historical necessity that socialism should precede communism.

Communism can only be achieved when a firm material and technological base for it has been created. Such a base makes it possible to electrify the whole country, and thus to achieve unprecedented technological progress, including comprehensive mechanization and automation. The chemical industry will play a major role in the national economy with the development of new energy sources and materials. Science and technology will develop at a rapid rate, with science being closely linked with production. People will attain much higher cultural standards.

There will be a new attitude to work in com-

---

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 284.

munist society–all people will regard work as a vital need. Work has already become an inner need under socialism, and the most impressive evidence of this is the widespread socialist emulation movement, particularly its highest form, the movement towards a new, communist attitude to work. Such an attitude will become prevalent in communist society. The nature of work itself will be changed in the process of building communism. Hard physical labour will completely disappear as a result of comprehensive mechanization and automation. In fact, physical and intellectual work will become indistinguishable. Work in agriculture will have all the characteristics of work in industry. Work will be a creative and attractive activity for all people.

As work to build a communist society is under way, socialist democracy is further developed. The emphasis here is on *"active participation of all citizens in the administration of the state, in the management of economic and cultural development, improvement of the government apparatus, and increased control over its activity by the people."* [1] The state will wither away in the process of building a communist society and will be replaced by communist self-government.

Socialist relations of production will gradually be transformed into communist relations in the process of building the material and technological base of communism. The two socialist forms of ownership–state and co-operative–will merge to become one form of public ownership of the means of production. This will signify the end of the division of society into classes. Com-

[1] *Programme of the CPSU*, p. 92.

munism is a classless and socially homogeneous society.

Of course, under socialism the principle of distribution of material wealth is more just than under capitalism. Whereas in capitalist society a larger share of material benefits is appropriated by capitalists, in socialist society, for the first time in history, material benefits are redistributed in accordance with the needs of its producers, in keeping with the quality and quantity of work.

Under socialism, however, people do not enjoy full equality in terms of material benefits. The following example shows why. Let us suppose that one worker has a family of two and another worker has a family of four, both workers having equal skills and doing the same job. Clearly, each member of the first family has a double share of material benefits.

What is needed for full material equality to become a reality is an abundance of material wealth which will make it possible to distribute it in accordance with people's needs. Socialism lays the groundwork for the implementation of this principle, and already a sizable part of material and cultural benefits in the Soviet Union is available to the public free of charge, drawn from what is known as public consumption funds. The areas covered by the funds include education at all levels, medical service and vacation arrangements. The funds will show a 40-per-cent growth in the 1970-75 period.

Enemies of communism do all they can to cast doubt on the feasibility of the communist principle of distribution in accordance with one's needs. Obviously, this principle is ruled out in capitalist society where the means of production

are privately owned. The present author was not surprised, therefore, when questions such as the following were addressed to him during a lecture in a Western country. The audience was largely hostile to communist principles.

"Suppose my wife will want to have a different set of jewelry for each day, what happens then?" asked one.

"And my wife may want to have Raphael's *Sistine Madonna*," said another.

"How is communism going to satisfy my needs if I will want, say, a new car every day?" asked a third. Lenin had given the answer to such questions as far back as 1917 when he said that communism "presupposes not the present productivity of labour and *not the present* ordinary run of people, who...are capable... of demanding the impossible." [1]

What Communists have in mind is man's reasonable needs. The men and women of communist society will be people of high moral standards having divested themselves of the acquisitive urge which is characteristic of a society based on private ownership. They will be free from capitalist morality, egoism, greediness and envy. The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union regards the need to mould the new man in the process of building a communist society as a matter of high priority.

The Peking "theorists" have their own view of communist society, a view that has nothing in common with scientific communism. They envision communism as an enormous barrack where everything is uniform–the food, clothes, etc. Only

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 469-70.

those whose malicious aim is to slander and discredit Marxism-Leninism in every possible way can come up with such nonsense.

The supreme goal of communism is to ensure man's all-round development and real freedom. Under communism people will no longer have to worry about earning a living—the abundance of material benefits will give them more opportunity to engage in their favourite pursuits and develop their abilities and talents to the full. Their work will serve the cause of progress. No society other than communist society can even set itself such goals, let alone achieve them.

Б. Дацюк
БЕСЕДЫ О НАУЧНОМ КОММУНИЗМЕ
(выпуск I)
на английском языке
Цена 12 коп.